



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/682,722	10/10/2001	David Goldberg	107150	3642

27074 7590 06/28/2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC.

P.O. BOX 19928

ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER
----------

REVAK, CHRISTOPHER A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

DATE MAILED: 06/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/682,722

Applicant(s)

GOLDBERG ET AL.

Examiner

Christopher A. Revak

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 October 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1,3-9, and 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yajima, U.S. Patent 6,681,372.

As per claim 1, it is disclosed by Yajima of a method for creating a notarized document from a document, Image data of the document is acquired and generating a document data file based on the image data. The document data file comprising an exemplar table that identifies position of an occurrence of an exemplar and a block table, determining connected components. The connected components are grouped into exemplars and creating the exemplar table based on the exemplars. The block table is grouped based on the exemplars and appending the document data file to the document (col. 2, lines 9-20 & 37-56; col. 3, lines 13-22; and col. 11, lines 50-57).

As per claim 3, Yajima teaches of identifying location information of at least one occurrence of an exemplar for each of the exemplars and storing the location information in the exemplar table (col. 11, lines 50-57).

As per claim 4, Yajima discloses of identifying a location of at least one occurrence of an exemplar for each of the exemplars and determining a dimension of the at least one occurrence of the exemplar from the identifying step. The location and the dimension of the at least one occurrence of the exemplar are stored in the exemplar table (col. 10, lines 50-61).

As per claim 5, it is taught by Yajima of determining a block of the connected components, identifying the position of an occurrence of one of the exemplars within the block, and storing the position in the block table (col. 10, lines 50-61).

As per claim 6, Yajima teaches of generating a fiducial point for each of the exemplars; generating a fine tuning positioning command for at least one of the exemplars. The fiducial points are stored in the exemplar table; storing the fine tuning positioning command in the block table and combining and compressing the exemplar table and the block table (col. 10, lines 50-61 and col. 25, lines 6-20).

As per claim 7, Yajima discloses of determining a block of the connected components and creating an exemplar histogram for each of the exemplars. A block histogram is created for the block, defining a baseline for the block, determining a baseline crossing for each of the exemplars in the block, and adding the baseline crossing for each of the exemplars to the respective exemplar histograms. The median of the baseline crossing values contained in each of the exemplar histograms are determined and designating the median of the baseline crossing values for each of the exemplar histograms as the fiducial point for the respective exemplar (col. 10, lines 50-61 and col. 25, lines 6-20).

As per claim 8, it is taught by Yajima of determining a block of the connected components and creating an actual position table that stores actual positions of the connected components on the document. Wherein generating fine tuning positioning commands comprises selecting at least one connected component of the connected components in the block and determining the position of the at least one connected component. The position of the at least one connected component is compared to a position of the corresponding connected component in the actual position table to determine if there is a difference and if there is a difference, adding position tuning commands to the block table for the exemplar that corresponds to the selected connected component to correct for the difference (col. 10, lines 50-61 and col. 25, lines 6-20).

As per claim 9, Yajima discloses of an apparatus that creates it notarized document from a document. It is taught of a controller, a memory that stores image data of the document, and connected components determining circuit that determines connected components based on the image data. A connected components grouping circuit that groups the connected components into a plurality of groups and generates an exemplar for each of the groups. An exemplar table generation circuit that generates an exemplar table by identifying positions of an occurrence for each of the exemplars. A block table generation circuit that generates a block table by identifying blocks of the connected components and determining the position of each occurrence for each of the exemplars in each of the blocks. A fiducial point generation circuit that generates a fiducial point for each of the exemplars and adds the fiducial point for each of the

Art Unit: 2131

exemplars to the exemplar table. A data appending circuit that appends the exemplar table and the block table to the document, wherein the controller operates the connected components determining circuit, the connected components grouping circuit, the exemplar table generation circuit, the block table generation circuit, the fiducial point generation circuit and the data appending circuit (col. 2, lines 9-20 & 37-56; col. 3, lines 13-22; col. 10, lines 50-61; col. 11, lines 50-57; col. 25, lines 6-20; and as shown in Figure 45).

As per claim 11, Yajima teaches of a position tuning circuit that adds positioning commands to the block table for each of the blocks based on a comparison of a placement of each of the connected components derived from the block table and the exemplar table to positions of the connected components (col. 10, lines 50-61 and col. 25, lines 6-20).

As per claim 12, Yajima discloses that the fiducial point generation circuit generates fiducial points for each of the exemplars and creating an exemplar histogram for each of the exemplars. A block histogram is created for the block, defining a baseline for the block, determining a baseline crossing for each of the exemplars in the block, and adding the baseline crossing for each of the exemplars to the respective exemplar histograms. The median of the baseline crossing values contained in each of the exemplar histograms are determined and designating the median of the baseline crossing values for each of the exemplar histograms as the fiducial point for the respective exemplar (col. 10, lines 50-61 and col. 25, lines 6-20).

As per claim 13, it is taught by Yajima that an image data source provides image data to memory (col. 5, lines 48-56).

As per claim 14, Yajima discloses that an input device provides commands to the controller (col. 5, lines 48-56).

As per claim 15, it is disclosed by Yajima that a printer prints the notarized document (col. 5, lines 48-56).

As per claim 16, Yajima teaches of a display that displays the notarized document (col. 5, lines 7-10).

As per claim 17, it is taught by Yajima of a an apparatus that verifies tie authenticity of a notarized document comprising a controller and a memory that stores image data of the notarized document that includes a document data file. A data reading circuit that reads the document data file and outputs to the memory an exemplar table and a block table of the document data. A decompression circuit that constructs a verifying document image using the exemplar table and the block table. A comparing circuit that compares the verifying document image to the image data of the notarized document and determines that the notarized document is not genuine if there are discrepancies between the verifying document image and the image data of the notarized document (col. 2, lines 9-20 & 37-56; col. 3, lines 13-22; col. 10, lines 50-61; col. 11, lines 50-57; col. 25, lines 6-20; and as shown in Figure 45).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2,10, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yajima, U.S. Patent 6,681,372 in view of Bisbee et al, U.S. Patent 5,615,268.

The teachings of Yajima fail to disclose of a digital signature that is used to verify the document file. It is disclosed by Bisbee et al that a digital signature is created for a document file (col. 3, lines 1-8). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to apply a digital signature to a document file for authenticity purposes. The teachings of Bisbee et al disclose of motivation for the use of digital signatures by reciting that comparison of the digital signature determines if the integrity of a document has been maintained (col. 3, lines 1-8). It is obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the teachings of Yajima would have found the teachings of Bisbee et al beneficial since the integrity of a document file can be maintained through use of a digital signature.

***Conclusion***

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher A. Revak whose telephone number is 571-272-3794. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 6:30am-4:00pm.



If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CR  
*an*

June 25, 2005

Christopher Revak  
AU 2131

*CR*  
*6/25/05*